

**COURIER**

Circ.: e 31,037  
S 31,382

Front Edit Other  
Page Page Page

Date MAY 7 1961

## Congressional Watchdog?

AT LEAST one benefit may be expected from the Cuban invasion debacle—tighter control by Congress over the activities and spending of the Central Intelligence Agency.

There are a number of other probes also scheduled. Former Army Chief of Staff Maxwell D. Taylor, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy are conducting an investigation of intelligence and guerrilla warfare tactics. General Taylor also will be a member of a six-man continuing advisory board, headed by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., which is

to advise the President with respect to the objectives and conduct of the foreign intelligence and related activities of the United States which are required in the interests of foreign-policy and national defense and security.

However, such advisory groups have in the past turned in long and comprehensive reports only to find them largely ignored. A presidential board seems to be no substitute for coming to grips with the real question: how can Congress keep tabs on a semi-secret organization and still enable it to work effectively?

Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey, D-Minn., said the CIA "needs more scrutinizing and less publicizing." It is expected that the Senate will go ahead with hearings soon on a resolution by Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy, D-Minn., to create a Senate-House joint committee on intelligence activities.

This has been often proposed in the past, but has been headed

off by CIA officials. As it stands now, a small group of senators and congressmen are given the details of the CIA budget, but they have no impact upon its policies. They were given no advance knowledge of the CIA's role in the Cuban invasion.

A joint committee in the atomic energy field has worked fairly well; its members do their homework and are respected lay authorities on the subject of atomic energy. Apparently, the same machinery can work in the field of intelligence and paramilitary operations.

As for congressional leaks, there should be few more than there are already within the Pentagon and other government departments. Congress has a fairly good "security" record, even through its precautions are not nearly as elaborate as in the executive branch.

There is, however, a difference. The intelligence activities of the government can withstand very little undue public exposure, whereas the joint Atomic Energy Committee deals with much non-military, non-security nuclear matters.

No hard and fast formula is possible in dealing with the role of secret intelligence operations in an open society. The objective only can be the best possible intelligence-gathering with the least possible harm to our democratic institutions. Congressional scrutiny by a small group of able and discreet legislators should be consistent with this objective.

The above editorial also appeared in the following other newspaper :

EAST ST. LOUIS JOURNAL, ILL. - MAY 5, 1961